

**REMARKS**

The Board of Appeals has upheld the Examiner's rejection of Claims 1-20 under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over the combination of Stiles and Tanaka.

Applicant respectfully request that the Examiner now reopen prosecution in view of Applicant's newly amended Claims 1-20, submitted herewith.

The Board has clearly indicated their basis for upholding the Examiner's position. To reopen prosecution on the merits, Applicant submits herewith claims that are amended to recite aspects of the invention that have heretofore not been included in Applicant's claim set. To whit:

"reducing said control input sets to at least one reduced control input set according to a reduction scheme; said step of reducing said control input sets comprising the further step of providing a configuration interface for specifying said reduction scheme as a mapping of said control input sets received by said video game controller hub onto said at least one reduced control input set provided to a video game console, said mapping comprising a mapping of said video game controllers onto at least one corresponding on-screen entity, said interface operable by at least one user of said video game controller hub to indicate how said control input sets from said corresponding plurality of video game controllers are to be combined to control said at least one on-screen entity..." (Claim 11; Claim 1 having a similar limitation)

Support for this limitation is found in the Specification at least at page 9, third paragraph.

While the Board has found that Stiles discloses the notion of collective control, Stiles at Figure 2 (and supporting text) only teaches a priority factor and a yaw attenuator function for a co-pilot. This is to be contrasted with Applicant's Figure 2 (and supporting text), which shows a mapping scheme. Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed mapping scheme would not be obvious to a skilled person in view of the weighting taught by Stiles. More significantly, Stiles only

teaches the use of weighting and attenuation for the co-pilot. That is, only a single channel is affected. Further, this is not a reduction scheme, but a sharing and weighting scheme. The purpose of Stiles is the opposite of that taught by Applicant in this regard. Applicant reduces a plurality of input controllers to a common output to control an on-screen entity, while Stiles provides parallel controls for an airplane, with one channel that may be weighted, *i.e.* the co-pilot, to give greater control to another, *i.e.* the pilot. In contrast, Applicant's mapping scheme provides for the combination of a plurality of controllers in connection with operation of an on-screen entity, where a mapping of a plurality of controllers is established. There is no mapping in Stiles because the pilot and co-pilot channels are hard wired. The two hard-wired channels of Stiles do not establish a mapping of many-to-one as claimed by Applicant, but maintain a hard-wired one-to-one relationship. This is readily apparent when comparing Applicant's Figure 2 with Figure 2 of Stiles.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that the claims as amended define patentable subject matter in view of the Examiner's cited reference and consistent with the findings of the Board. Accordingly, Applicant earnestly solicits the Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of rejection, such that the application may pass to issuance as U.S. Letters patent.

Should the Examiner deem it helpful, he is encouraged to contact applicant's attorney, Michael A. Glenn, at (650) 474-8400.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael A. Glenn  
Reg. No. 30,176

Customer No. 22862